REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in this application. Applicant is respectfully requesting reconsideration of the restriction requirement in view of the following remarks.

Claims of the present application have been subjected to a Restriction Requirement under 35 U.S.C. §121 and 372 by the Examiner in this case. The Examiner suggests that the application contains the following inventions which are not linked so as to from a single inventive concept under Rule 13.1:

Group I, claims 1-2, drawn to a method for producing a 34 kDa truncated plasmin proteolytic protein and a 34 kDa truncated plasmin proteolytic protein; and

Group II, claims 3-5, drawn to a method for modulating the expression of membrane type 1 matrix metalloproteinase by administering an effective amount of a plasminogen activator inhibitor type 1 isoform lacking a reactive center loop and containing a complete heparin-binding domain or lacking a portion of a heparin-binding domain.

The Examiner suggests that the inventions listed as Groups I and II are independent and distinct from each other as they do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding technical features. It is suggested that Mulligan-Kehoe et al. ((2001) *J. Biol. Chem.* 276:8588-8596) teach a method for producing a 34 kDa truncated plasmin proteolytic protein comprising combining plasminogen and rPAI-1_{23} to produce a truncated plasmin proteolytic protein that is 34 kDa. The Examiner suggests the because the inventions do not contribute a special technical feature when viewed over the prior art, they do

not have a single inventive concept and lack unity of invention. Applicant is required to elect one of the Groups to be examined. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this restriction requirement.

At the outset, Applicant respectfully wishes to point out that the method set forth in the claims of Group I is distinct from that disclosed by Mulligan-Kehoe et al. While this reference teaches at page 8590 (col. 1) that "rPAI-1_{23} protein (30-120 nM) was bound to 10 nM of uPA at room temperature for 1 hour." and "Following this reaction 33 nM of plasminogen was added to the rPAI-1_{23}·uPA reaction mix and incubated at 37°C for 20-30 min.", this reference does not teach combining plasminogen and rPAI-1_{23} for a specified amount of time and *subsequently adding uPA*. The specification teaches at pages 23-29 that the order in which the reaction components are added is essential to quantity and quality of products produced. Further, the methods of Group I and II claims are linked by the use of rPAI-1_{23}, *i.e.*, a plasminogen activator inhibitor type 1 isoform lacking a reactive center loop and lacking a portion of a heparin-binding domain. Thus, there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features thereby fulfilling the requirement of unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this restriction requirement be reconsidered and withdrawn.

However, in an earnest effort to be completely responsive, Applicant hereby elects to prosecute Group I, claims 1-2, drawn to a method for producing a 34 kDa truncated plasmin proteolytic

protein and a 34 kDa truncated plasmin proteolytic protein, with traverse.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Massey Licata
Registration No. 32,257

Date: **August 25, 2005**

Licata & Tyrrell P.C.
66 E. Main Street
Marlton, New Jersey 08053

(856) 810-1515